DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2957/307010.01 Application No.: 10/814,067

Office Action Dated: 02/17/2009

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are now pending in this application. In the outstanding office action, claims 1-28 stand rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6.687,903 B1 ("Cebula") in view of United States Patent Number 7.213,175 ("Morrison"). Claims 1-4, 6-10, 14-18, 20, 22-23 and 29 have been amended. Claims 21 and 24 have been canceled. No new matter is added.

Rejection Of Claims 1-6

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious under by Cebula in view of Morrison. Claim 1 as amended recites a system for multi-environment testing automation comprising a processor, wherein the processor is configured to receive at least one Test Information, receives at least one Test Information, each Test Information associated with a respective Test and a respective Test Document describing the Test and comprising a plurality of parallel Tasks, each Task comprising at least one Step, each Step describing an action to perform in a specific environment and comprising an Executor action, a Verifier action, and an Expected Results. Claim 1 further recites that the processor for each Step performs an associated Executor action to generate associated Execution Results and performs an associated Verifier action to compare the associated Execution Results to an associated Expected Results.

Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on page 7 of the specification. Briefly summarizing, using a META system, a Test may comprise parallel Tasks. Each Task may contain one or more sequential steps, wherein each step is composed of an Executor, zero or more Filters, a Verifier and one or more sets of Expected Results. For each Test, the Executor is responsible for executing the Steps and generating some useful output (i.e., Execution Results). The Execution Results are passed through zero or more Filters and then passed to a Verifier. which compares the results generated by the Executor to some Expected results that were generated previously and determines whether the Step has passed or failed.

Cebula relates to a system and method for software testing including analyzing source code under test to generate a scan file including a map of the source code under test and a tree DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2957/307010.01 Application No.: 10/814,067 Office Action Dated: 02/17/2009

structure for the source code under test, generating a stub file for the source code under test based upon the scan file, generating a driver test script file based on the scan file and the stub file, generating a test driver based on the driver test script file and running the test driver on the source code under tests to generate a results file for summarizing the results of the software testing.

Morrison relates to a framework for managing an application's relationship to a runtime environment. The framework allows detection of deadlock detection and allows a test suite to be multi-threaded.

Neither Cebula nor Morrison taken alone or in combination teach or suggest a processor configured to receive at least one Test Information, each Test Information associated with a respective Test and a respective Test Document describing the test and comprising a plurality of parallel Tasks, each Task comprising at least one Step, each Step describing an action to perform in a specific environment and comprising an Executor action, a Verifier action, and an Expected Results as recited in amended claim 1. Further, neither Cebula nor Morrison taken alone or in combination teaches a processor configured to for each step perform an associated Executor action to generate associated Execution Results and performs an associated Verifier action to compare the associated Execution Results to an associated Executed Results as recited in amended claim 1.

Cebula and Morrison taken alone or in combination further fail to disclose a Test
Document that describes an associated environment for performing tests as recited in claim 1.

An associated environment for each test allows particular tests to be performed across various platforms and environments.

Thus, for at least these reasons, because the references fail to teach or suggest the cited claim limitations, claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 2-6 depend from and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 1, claims 2-6 should also be allowed.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2957/307010.01 Application No.: 10/814,067 Office Action Dated: 02/17/2009

Rejection Of Claims 7-8

Claim 7 as amended recites a system including a processor that maintains a plurality of Tests in a common format, wherein each of the Tests comprises a plurality of Tasks, wherein each Task further comprises a plurality of Steps, each step comprising an Executor action, a Verifier action and one or more Expected Results. Claim 7 as amended further recites that the processor for each Step, utilizes an associated Executor action to generate Execution Results and for each step utilizes an associated Verifier action to compare the Execution Results to associated Expected Results to determine whether the step passes or fails a Test.

For at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 1, claim 7 should also be allowed.

Claim 8 depends from and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 7. Thus, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 7, claim 8 should also be allowed.

Rejection Of Claims 9-14

Claim 9 as amended recites a method for grouping a plurality of multi-threaded Tests maintained in a common format into a Test Store, said Test Store comprising data pertaining to Tests it contains, each said Test associated with a respective Test Information comprising a plurality of parallel Tasks, wherein each Task further comprises at least one Step and wherein each Step describes an action to take in a specific environment and is comprised of an Executor action, a Verifier action and at least one Expected Result.

For at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 1, claim 9 should also be allowed.

Claims 10-14 depend from and therefore include all the limitations of claim 9. Thus, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 9, claims 10-14 should also be allowed.

Rejection Of Claims 15-20 and 22-28

Claim 15 as amended recites a computer-readable storage medium including instructions for receiving at least one Test Information, each Test Information associated with a respective Test and comprising a plurality of parallel Tasks, wherein each Task further comprises at least one Step and wherein each Step describes an action to take in a specific environment and

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2957/307010.01 Application No.: 10/814,067 Office Action Dated: 02/17/2009

comprises an associated Executor action, an associated Verifier action and at least one associated Expected Result. Claim 15 as amended further recites using each Executor action for each respective step to generate associated Execution Results and using each Verifier action for each respective test to compare the associated Execution results with associated Expected Results.

For at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 1, claim 15 should also be allowed. Claims 16-20 and 22-28 depend from and therefore include all the limitations of claim 15. Thus, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 15, claims 16-20 and 22-28 should also be allowed.

Rejection Of Claim 29

Claim 29 as amended recites a method comprising grouping at least one multi-threaded Test into a Test Store, each said Test associated with a respective Test Information comprising a plurality of parallel Tasks, wherein each Task further comprises at least one Step and wherein each Step describes an action to take in a specific environment and comprises an Executor action, a Verifier action and at least one Expected Result.

Thus, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 1, claim 29 should also be allowed.

PATENT

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2957/307010.01 Application No.: 10/814,067 Office Action Dated: 02/17/2009

.....

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: May 18, 2009 /Joseph F. Oriti/ Joseph F. Oriti Registration No. 47835

Woodcock Washburn LLP Cira Centre 2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891 Telephone: (215) 568-3100 Facsimile: (215) 568-3439